

REMARKS

Claims 21-24 have been added to claim the features recited therein.

Claims 1-4, 8, 10, 12-14 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Okayasu (US 6,419,515). The examiner is requested to reconsider this rejection.

Okayasu discloses **two** electrical connectors; one with a male connector housing 10 and male contacts 13, and one with a female connector housing 20 and mating female contacts 26. Okayasu does not disclose that the two housings 10, 20 are part of a same electrical connector. Okayasu only discloses that the housings 10, 20 are parts of two separate distinct electrical connectors.

Claim 1 claims "an electrical connector"; not two electrical connectors. Applicant, in claim 1, is claiming a single electrical connector; not two electrical connectors. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Okayasu of providing both the connector housings 10, 20 in a single electrical connector. If, for the sake of argument, male and female connector housings 10, 20 were both considered a single electrical connector, then locking arm 40 would not be "a mating electrical connector latch". Male connector housing 10 either has to be a housing of the electrical connector with housing 20 or a mating electrical connector housing. It cannot be both. Male connector housing 10 is clearly only a housing of mating electrical connector. Claim 1 also claims that the lever arm is sized and shaped to pivot on top of a portion of the second housing member. Locking arm 40 pivots at fulcrum

42; not on top of a portion of the mating electrical housing 10. As seen in Fig. 9, the leading edge of the mating electrical housing 10 does not go under the fulcrum 42. Thus, Okayasu does not disclose or suggest that the locking arm 40 is sized and shaped to pivot on top of a portion of the housing 10. The features of claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested in the art of record. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 2-4 and 8 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 1. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claim 10 claims an electrical connector housing; not two electrical connector housings. Applicant, in claim 10, is claiming a single electrical connector housing; not two electrical connector housings. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Okayasu of providing both the connector housings 10, 20 as a housing for a single electrical connector. Male connector housing 10 is clearly only a housing of a **mating electrical connector**; not part of a same electrical connector housing as the female electrical connector housing 20. Claim 10 also claims that the second housing member is sized and shaped to be contacted by the second end of the latch to **limit movement** of the second end of the latch in an **outward direction**. Stop face 47 on the locking member 43 of the locking arm 40 contacts the stopping member 16 of the male mating electrical connector's housing 10, but there is no disclosure or suggestion that the stopping member 16 limits

movement of the locking member 43 of the locking arm **in an outward direction**. Stopping member 16 of the male mating electrical connector's housing 10 merely wedges the locking member 43 outward during mating of the two electrical connectors and latches into the groove 46. Nowhere is there a disclosure or suggestion of stopping member 16 in any way **limiting movement** of the locking member 43 of the locking arm **in an outward direction**. Claim 10 claims that the second housing member comprising a latch overstress protection section. There is not disclosure or suggestion in Okayasu that stopping member 16 forms a latch overstress protection section. The features of claim 10 are not disclosed or suggested in Okayasu. Therefore, claim 10 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 12-14 and 16-17 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 10. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Appl. No.: 10/806,731
Reply to Office Action of: 08/26/2005

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington 11/22/05
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686) Date

Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

11/22/2005
Date

Elaine F. Mian
Name of Person Making Deposit